

Date: Mon, 13 Dec 93 04:30:25 PST
From: Ham-Policy Mailing List and Newsgroup <ham-policy@ucsd.edu>
Errors-To: Ham-Policy-Errors@UCSD.Edu
Reply-To: Ham-Policy@UCSD.Edu
Precedence: Bulk
Subject: Ham-Policy Digest V93 #524
To: Ham-Policy

Ham-Policy Digest Mon, 13 Dec 93 Volume 93 : Issue 524

Today's Topics:

 Can my wife transmit? (5 msgs)
 W5YI's coverage of "temporary callsigns"
 Why isn't Amateur Radio like CB?
 Why should I bother? (3 msgs)

Send Replies or notes for publication to: <Ham-Policy@UCSD.Edu>
Send subscription requests to: <Ham-Policy-REQUEST@UCSD.Edu>
Problems you can't solve otherwise to brian@ucsd.edu.

Archives of past issues of the Ham-Policy Digest are available
(by FTP only) from UCSD.Edu in directory "mailarchives/ham-policy".

We trust that readers are intelligent enough to realize that all text
herein consists of personal comments and does not represent the official
policies or positions of any party. Your mileage may vary. So there.

Date: 12 Dec 93 05:20:09 GMT
From: ogicse!emory!swrindle!ringer!lonestar.utsa.edu!dlaro@network.ucsd.edu
Subject: Can my wife transmit?
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

In article <1993Dec9.200425.24723@mixcom.mixcom.com> kevin.jessup
<kevin.jessup@mixcom.mixcom.com> writes:
>
>Will she be fined for transmitting on amateur bands without a licence?
>Will I be fined? Will I loose my licence? Will the radio be confiscated?

Come on, think! How could you be fined for your wife's act?

>
>Does she have to nearly die from exposure before it is obviously a life
>or death situation?
>
>What about something not so life threatening: she has car trouble (even
>something as simple as a flat tire) in a not-so-nice area of town.

>Can she call for help on 2 meters? Does she have to wait till the
>robbers and rapists are pounding on the windows (and removing the
>antenna) before she can call for help?? Please, ARRL and FCC people,
>can you answer this one? Thanks.

First, if you really want an "ARRL and FCC people" answer, you should try writing to those agencies. Asking a question on Usenet hardly qualifies as obtaining solid legal advise.

Since you're apparently concerned, why don't you:

- a. Get her a cellular phone.
- b. See that she gets her license.
- c. Ask her not to drive through not-so-nice areas of town.
- d. Try one of the other alternatives that can quickly spring to mind.

Hypothetical replies to questions about hypothetical situations don't always go where you want them to, Keven, but if you're really worried about having told her to use your radio, remember what my flight instructor told me: I'd rather be on the ground writing answers to all those violations they charge me with than in little pieces on a hillside.

David, kb5nz

Date: 9 Dec 1993 23:24:55 GMT
From: pravda.sdsc.edu!usc!howland.reston.ans.net!newsserver.jvnc.net!
netnews.upenn.edu!msuinfo!arctic2!cravitma@network.ucsd.edu
Subject: Can my wife transmit?
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

Note that I am not a lawyer, FCC official, ARRL official, or anyone else like that. The following is therefore to be taken with a few grains of salt, as it is based on MY logical interpretation of the FCC rules (and the ARRL FCC Rulebook). Having said that,

In article <1993Dec9.200425.24723@mixcom.mixcom.com> kevin.jessup
<kevin.jessup@mixcom.mixcom.com> writes:

>
>My wife and 4-year-old son are on a not-so-well traveled highway between
>cities. She has car trouble. It's dark. It's the middle of Winter.
>She has waited for an hour. The few cars that went by did not stop to help.
>
>She fires up my 50 Watt 2-meter mobile rig that I have conveniently
>locked-on to one of the well-used, wide-coverage repeaters in the area.
>She transmits, asks for help, and the sheriff soon arrives and rescues
>them.
>

>Will she be fined for transmitting on amateur bands without a licence?
>Will I be fined? Will I loose my licence? Will the radio be confiscated?

I would think not. In my opinion (such as it is), the facts that :

1. It is winter, and cold.
2. There is no sign that help is forthcoming
3. Since she is stopped by the side of the road, there is a distinct possibility of another car colliding with hers (this happened to a friend of mine, who fractured her spine in the resulting collision)

would tend to justify that there is a distinct probability of danger, and in turn I could see calling such an emergency in good conscience. As I recall, the ARRL in their FCC rule book stated that due to the danger of a collision with another car, this situation would justify emergency procedures.

>Does she have to nearly die from exposure before it is obviously a life >or death situation?

By my interpretation, "danger to life" does not necessarily imply being seconds away from death. I would say that this would be acceptable. Of course the FCC may disagree with you (and me), but I think this could be defensible.

>What about something not so life threatening: she has car trouble (even >something as simple as a flat tire) in a not-so-nice area of town.

I think this would also be defensible. See above.

Now, can anyone who actually KNOWS the answer corroborate or refute my interpretation?

/Matthew

--

Matthew Cravit
Michigan State University
East Lansing, MI 48825
E-Mail: cravitma@cps.msu.edu

| All opinions expressed here are
| my own. I don't speak for Michigan
| State, and they don't speak for me
| (thank goodness).

Date: 10 Dec 1993 13:13:49 GMT
From: yeshua.marcam.com!zip.eecs.umich.edu!destroyer!news1.oakland.edu!
vela.acs.oakland.edu!prvalko@uunet.uu.net
Subject: Can my wife transmit?

To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

: My wife and 4-year-old son are on a not-so-well traveled highway between
: cities. She has car trouble. It's dark. It's the middle of Winter.
: She has waited for an hour. The few cars that went by did not stop to help.
: She fires up my 50 Watt 2-meter mobile rig that I have conveniently
: locked-on to one of the well-used, wide-coverage repeaters in the area.
: She transmits, asks for help, and the sheriff soon arrives and rescues
: them.
: Will she be fined for transmitting on amateur bands without a licence?
: Will I be fined? Will I lose my licence? Will the radio be confiscated?

- 1) YES!!!! You will be fined! It is much cheaper to have your family attacked. I bet it will set you back the cost of a new dual-band HT.
- 2) YES! ABSOLUTELY! If your license is loose in your wallet, you will eventually lose it!
- 3) OH MY GOD! Take my wife and family but PUHLEEZE don't take my Kenwood TM-732a.

I can not believe some of you guys are *EVEN* worried about the consequences of someone using a ham radio in these instances.

73 paul wb8zjl

Date: 13 Dec 93 07:44:52 GMT
From: brunix!doorknob!sds@uunet.uu.net
Subject: Can my wife transmit?
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

> If you only need emergency communication gear, buy a cb and call on
> channel 9.

Um, does this really work? Before I had my ticket, I tried calling a few different roadside emergencies in... but I never once got a response. This was in an area that I know has great 2m and 440 repeater coverage.

Scott - scott_swanson@brown.edu - n9sat

Date: 10 Dec 93 10:40:05 CST
From: timbuk.cray.com!hemlock.cray.com!cherry10!dadams@uunet.uu.net
Subject: Can my wife transmit?

To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

In article 151a@msuinfo.cl.msu.edu, cravitma@arctic2.uucp (Matthew B Cravit) writes:

[snip, snip...]

|>Does she have to nearly die from exposure before it is obviously a life
|>or death situation?

|
|By my interpretation, "danger to life" does not necessarily imply
|being seconds away from death. I would say that this would be
|acceptable. Of course the FCC may disagree with you (and me), but I
|think this could be defensible.

I get the impression with all that the FCC has done to let the amateurs police their own bands, that the FCC would like hams to make reasonable interpretations and not pickuny "die by the letter of the law" decisions. The whole basis behind the rules about emergency broadcasting is to save lives and property! If we do that then we are justified of our reasonable emergency use. So say I.

|Now, can anyone who actually KNOWS the answer corroborate or refute
|my interpretation?

Ok, ya got me there.

I think the problems tend to arrise more when we come into conflict with some other organization like local police or city hall. Beurocrats can be so bull headed, and yes they sometimes do tend to "die by the letter of the law."

Since the case where the unlicensed wife, who transmits in a life threatening emergency, does not concern city hall nor the local police I really don't think it is a problem to worry about.

| /Matthew

|

|--

|Matthew Cravit
|Michigan State University
|East Lansing, MI 48825
|E-Mail: cravitma@cps.msu.edu

| All opinions expressed here are
| my own. I don't speak for Michigan
| State, and they don't speak for me
| (thank goodness).

Sourdough and Ham KG0IO

--David C. Adams internet: dadams@cray.com
Statistician uunet: uunet!cray!dadams
Cray Research Inc. packet: kg0io@tcman.ams.msp.mn.usa.noam

Experience --> Identify --> Analyze --> Generalize

Date: Wed, 8 Dec 1993 00:46:30 GMT
From: netcomsv!netcom.com!jfh@decwrl.dec.com
Subject: W5YI's coverage of "temporary callsigns"
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

md@maxcy2.maxcy.brown.edu (Michael P. Deignan) wrote:

```
>> You can't do it this way. (HINT: Ever wonder why /AT isn't used for  
>> technician upgrades?)  
>  
>No, I'm clueless. Why isn't /AT used for tech upgrades?
```

Because it could be confused with a usage of the form KD6TTL/ZL1. The US "owns" prefixes AG, AE, and AA, so KD6TTL/AG wouldn't appear to be from another country, but we don't own AT (which is not assigned, according to my Callbook).

Jack Hamilton POB 281107 SF CA 94128 USA
jfh@netcom.com kd6ttl@w6pw.#nocal.ca.us.na

Date: 13 Dec 93 07:39:46 GMT
From: brunix!doorknob!sds@uunet.uu.net
Subject: Why isn't Amateur Radio like CB?
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

In article <2e9ftn\$ill@cismsun.univ-lyon1.fr> elendir@enst.fr () writes:
Two-meters band was *relatively* protected up to now, but it seems to be
increasingly polluted by "pirates". UHF seems to be still untouched. I wonder
something. If it was mandatory to show the ham-licence when buying some
equipement, wouldn't it eliminate some problems by avoiding jerks to buy
transceivers ?

Isn't this standard practice? I know that at the store where I buy all of my equipment, the standard question when they fill out the sales ticket is "Name? Call? Address?"...

Scott_Swanson@brown.edu - n9sat

Date: 12 Dec 93 01:34:00 GMT
From: hearst.acc.Virginia.EDU!pplace!pat.wilson@uunet.uu.net
Subject: Why should I bother?
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

-> In light of this, is there really any reason for me to bother reading
-> rec.radio.amateur.policy, much less try to contribute? Or to
-> encourage others to do so?
->
-> -- Ed Ellers, KD4AWQ

No.

(hehhahhahahah)

Pat Wilson (N0RDQ)

Date: Sun, 12 DEC 93 01:32:22 EST
From: noc.near.net!news.delphi.com!usenet@uunet.uu.net
Subject: Why should I bother?
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

To: All rec.radio.amateur.policy users

I'm writing this to express my disgust with the treatment I've received from a few of the r.r.a.p regulars. When I first started leaving messages in this newsgroup it was to try to make an intelligent contribution to the debate, mostly on the subject of the Morse Code requirement for HF access. I guess I should have expected the rebuttals I got...but I never expected the blistering I've received here.

First, of course, it was from some of the anti-no-code contingent, especially Robert (whose call I have forgotten). A disagreement is one thing, but the sort of "Breaker-breaker good buddy!" nonsense I got from him was really not

called for, nor is the implication that anyone who objects to the Morse requirement is somehow "lazy."

But what is really incredible was the amount of flak I have caught for the "crime" of not quoting liberally from the posts I reply to! I've certainly noticed how common it is for a user to include the full text of the message being replied to in the reply -- or even the past two or three, as the quotes cascade -- and I've been somewhat annoyed at having to read through all that stuff, but I haven't complained about it. But when I reply in a normal fashion with only my own words, I get remarks about how I'm somehow being inconsiderate; I've virtually been ORDERED to either quote the previous message or not bother to reply, and Robert has popped up with the bizarre claim that my posts appear as though I am talking to myself. (Something which makes no sense, as there would be no point in posting to Usenet if I actually intended to talk to myself.)

When I have explained that, because of the nature of the host (Delphi) I use to access Usenet, it's not feasible to automatically add message text to a reply (as many here apparently do), and have noted what steps I would have to take to include text, I have been blistered for somehow using an "obsolete" newsreader (rather difficult when Delphi only wrote it a few months ago). Never mind the fact that Delphi's newsreader does provide the ability to refer back to previous messages, obviating any need to quote them!

The last straw was when one fellow here (a VK) told me that he was adding my name to his killfile, as though I were some sort of scum unworthy of his valuable time. All because I refuse to jump through hoops in order to conform to rules that a few people here seem to insist on -- rules that have NOT been demanded of me in other Usenet newsgroups in which I participate.

In light of this, is there really any reason for me to bother reading rec.radio.amateur.policy, much less try to contribute? Or to encourage others to do so?

-- Ed Ellers, KD4AWQ

Date: Sun, 12 Dec 1993 07:54:31 GMT
From: news.Hawaii.Edu!uhunix3.uhcc.Hawaii.Edu!jherman@ames.arpa
Subject: Why should I bother?
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

In article <931212.05542.EDELLERS@delphi.com> Ed Ellers <EDELLERS@delphi.com> writes:
>To: All rec.radio.amateur.policy users
>
>I'm writing this to express my disgust with the treatment I've received from

>a few of the r.r.a.p regulars.
> ...<much scolding deleted>...
--- Ed Ellers, KD4AWQ <---+
 ^^^^^ |__CONGRATULATIONS!!

Ed, you forgot to mention my ``1750 and 11 meter options'' I kept suggesting for no-code HF.

Anyway, you've got to use caution when posting on .policy. In many ways posting on here is like walking through a pride of sleeping lions while carrying a platter of freshly cooked steaks ...

No, that's a bad analogy. How about: posting on here is similar to walking on a bed of hot coals while carrying a can of gasoline...

Well, just keep a stiff upper lip (whatever that means). And congratulations, KD4AWQ!!

Jeff NH6IL

Date: Sun, 12 Dec 1993 08:10:16 GMT
From: news.Hawaii.Edu!uhunix3.uhcc.Hawaii.Edu!jherman@ames.arpa
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

References <2eat91INN5ip@nighthawk.ksu.ksu.edu>, <CHuuyu.J5C@news.Hawaii.Edu>, <2eegfaINNjhd@matt.ksu.ksu.edu>
Subject : Re: The 10-meters band - No CW required ?

In article <2eegfaINNjhd@matt.ksu.ksu.edu> cbr600@matt.ksu.ksu.edu (Jeremy L. Utley) writes:

>In article <CHuuyu.J5C@news.Hawaii.Edu> jherman@uhunix3.uhcc.Hawaii.Edu (Jeff Herman) writes:

>>Only a fool would want to be given something of value without working
>>for it. Study the history of the hobby and you'll better understand
>>why code is given the special place it deserves.

>>

>>Jeff NH6IL

>

>Well, Jeff, I did some reading of the history of amateur radio, and If I
>remember right, the morse code requirement first came about because when
>the first amateurs were demonstrating to the FCC, their voice modulators
>went out on them, so they switched to morse code and carried on the demon-
stration. While this was entirely possible back in the days of cobbled

First let me explain why I chose the word ``fool''. You see the ^^^^'s above? They were supposed to be underlining the word fool in a previous article that went something like ``... foolish WARC require-

ment...'' I have no idea what happened to that quote! Maybe it passed through Ed's newsreader :}

Now, I wonder what period of history you are studying - must not be too early since you are mentioning the FCC. Please start around 1915. One of my favorite books is ``200 Meters And Down'' available at almost any radio shop. Once you've read it we can discuss opinions via email, if you'd like.

Jeff NH6IL

Date: 10 Dec 1993 20:10:12 GMT
From: ucsnews!sol.ctr.columbia.edu!howland.reston.ans.net!gatech!asuvax!chnews!
news@network.ucsd.edu
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

References <gregCHMBrt.Err@netcom.com>, <2e51uo\$q16@chnews.intel.com>,
<CHt6uM.8qC@sugar.NeoSoft.COM>s
Subject : Re: ARRL's callsign admin position

In article <CHt6uM.8qC@sugar.NeoSoft.COM>
rcoyle@NeoSoft.com (Robert Coyle) remarks on my posting an old
'Radio Amateur's Code':

>> *TWO* THE AMATEUR IS LOYAL . . . He owes his amateur radio to the
>> American Radio Relay League, and he offers it his unswerving
>> loyalty.

>You MUST be kidding.

> --Robert

Send me a phone number and I'll fax you a copy of the page.

Jim, W5GYJ

Date: 12 Dec 1993 10:27:15 GMT
From: olivea!inews.intel.com!ilx018.intel.com!ilx049!dbraun@ames.arpna
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

References <1993Dec8.003950.10070@mnemosyne.cs.du.edu>,
<gregCHpypr.4sB@netcom.com>, <1993Dec8.182049.22789@Csli.Stanford.EDU>

Reply-To : dbraun@iil.intel.com
Subject : Re: Scratchi, January, 1960

I think that the "Schatchy" article is extremely offensive to Beatniks.

--

Doug Braun Intel Israel, Ltd. M/S: IDC1-41
Tel: 011-972-4-655069 dbraun@inside.intel.com

Date: 12 Dec 93 16:10:07 GMT
From: gsm001!gsm001.mendelson.com!gsmlrn@uunet.uu.net
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

References <igZ8Dc2w165w@p-cove.UUCP>,
<1993Dec11.215424.16049@gsm001.mendelson.com>,
<POPOVICH.93Dec11180306@laverne.cs.columbia.edu>
Subject : Re: Question about radio pirating...

In article <POPOVICH.93Dec11180306@laverne.cs.columbia.edu>
popovich@laverne.cs.columbia.edu (Steve Popovich) writes:

Me:

>> At one time a guy showed up on a local repeater as N2KMA (phonetics
>> Kiss My A..) it was kind of obvious that if there was an N2KMA (and there
>> most likely is) this person was not they.

Steve:

>Yeah, I'll say. Take a look at the on-line callbook listing for the
>real N2KMA:

>Call-Sign: N2KMA Class: TECHNICIAN
>Previously: KB2ITX Class: NOVICE
>Real Name: FRANCES STRIEGL Birthday: NOV 2, 1952
>Mailing Address: RT 10 BOX 161A, ATHENS, AL 35611
>Valid From: JAN 15, 1991 To: JAN 15, 2001
>

>From the name, if it was a GUY, it's most likely not N2KMA. Plus, the
>address in Alabama isn't too encouraging, either. You're in the 215
>area code; that's Philly, right? I always wondered what ever
>possessed people to become bootleggers or jammers. I just can't see
>what they think might be fun about it.

This guy appeared less than 24 hours after a 2m rig was stolen from someone's car. I guess he thought it was a cb and decided to try it anyway.

Pardon the political incorrectness, but I send code the way Mr Scratchi "speak the English".

Geoff.

--
I used to talk to myself..... Now that I am a ham, I send code to myself:

Geoffrey S. Mendelson N30WJ (215) 242-8712 gsm@mendelson.com

End of Ham-Policy Digest V93 #524

